

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the non-final Office Action mailed on April 21, 2008. A three-month extension of time fee is submitted herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-1818. If such a withdrawal is made, please indicate the Attorney Docket No. 117454-002 on the account statement.

In the Office Action, Claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Wakiya et al. (WO/2002/035555- the US equivalent 2004/0109995) ("*Wakiya*"). Claims 8 and 14 are the only independent claims in the application and Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention can be distinguished from *Wakiya*. *Wakiya* teaches a coated particle, which comprises a metal-surfaced particle as a core and results from a partial modification of the surface thereof with an organic compound via a functional group (A) capable of binding to a metal. The words of "partial surface modification with an organic compound" mean that the whole surface is not completely covered with that organic compound. See Abstract and [0011]. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that *Wakiya* does not teach, disclose or suggest a whole surface-treatment of a resin layer with a polyfunctional aziridine compound, as claimed.

Moreover, *Wakiya* points out that the strength of bonding between a conventional resin used for coating and a metal is weak, since the resin is only physically adsorbed on the metal-plated particles. See [0003]. Accordingly, in *Wakiya*, the metal-surfaced particle is not physically coated with the organic compound. It is chemically reacted therewith to form a resin coating layer. This results in unreacted organic compound, as recited in the working Examples. Therefore, the coated particle of *Wakiya* is a coated particle subjected to partial surface modification with the organic compound. The organic compound used in *Wakiya* has a carboxyl group as the functional group (A), where the organic compound is adsorbed onto the metal surface by having the functional group (A) chemically reacting with the metal surface. This is distinguished from the claimed invention where the insulating resin is physically adsorbed onto the metal surface according to the usual manner, See Applicant's published application at [0023], and then the insulating resin is surface-treated with the polyfunctional aziridine compound. The use of *Wakiya*'s teaching of chemically binding the functional group (A) to the metal surface

would leave no functional groups for reacting with the polyfunctional aziridine compound and would not result in the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants request that the anticipation and obviousness rejections to these claims be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, Claims 8-11, 14-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over *Soken Chem.* (JP 08-325543) ("*Soken*"). The Examiner cites *Soken* for its alleged disclosure of anisotropically electroconductive adhesive with metal based particles, features of acrylic and carboxyl elements, an epoxy component and surface treating the particles with Applicants' aziridine compound. *Soken* is directed to an anisotropic conductive adhesive comprising an acrylic adhesive component. Applicants respectfully submit that the acrylic adhesive in *Soken* is a binder component for an anisotropic conductive adhesive, but not a coating material for a conductive particle to be contained in an anisotropic conductive. In addition, although *Soken* refers to an aziridine compound, See [0043], [0044], this aziridine compound is used to cure the acrylic adhesive as a binder for an anisotropic conductive adhesive. Further, although *Soken* describes a conductive particle, See [0049], there is no disclosure not only of an insulating resin having a carboxylic group but also of an aziridine compound, in contrast to the claimed invention. Therefore *Soken* can be distinguished from the claimed invention and consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the anticipation and obviousness rejections be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, Claims 8-12 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. (US 5965064) ("*Yamada*") in view of *Soken Chem.* (JP 08-325543) ("*Soken*") or Mitsubishi (JP 09-030112) ("*Mitsubishi*") or Travis (US 3,985,920) ("*Travis*"). Applicants submit that the cited references are not properly combinable. Even if the cited art is combinable, it does not teach, disclose or suggest all the limitations of the claimed invention. *Yamada* merely teaches that a conductive particle is coated with a resin having been cross-linked. See column 5, lines 26-34. A cross linked layer is a resin layer having already been cross-linked, and is different from an insulating resin layer as claimed where the insulating resin layer is formed on the surface of a conductive particle and is subjected to surface-treatment with an aziridine compound. In addition, as the Examiner acknowledges, *Yamada* also fails to teach a surface-treatment with an aziridine compound. Further, an acrylic resin in *Soken* is not used for coating of a conductive particle. *Mitsubishi* and *Travis* are not

relevant art as they are from a different technical field as compared to *Yamada*, and merely teach that a resin having a carboxylic group is reacted with an aziridine compound. *Mitsubishi* is directed to an ink jet receiving material. *Travis* is directed to coating of vinyl resin on non-porous substrates. For the foregoing reasons, Applicants request that the obviousness rejection be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, Claims 10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wakiya et al.* in view of *Soken*, *Mitsubishi* or *Travis*. Claims 10 and 16 depend from Independent Claims 8 and 14, respectively. As discussed above, the independent claims are distinguished from the cited art and at least for these reasons, the dependent claims are distinguishable as well. Therefore, Applicants request that the obviousness rejections be withdrawn.

The Examiner objected to the information disclosure statement filed 01/20/06 and alleged that Patent Document No. 10016041A1 from Germany and the article by Motohide Takechi were not accompanied by a translation. Document No. 10016041A1 from Germany was cited in the International Preliminary Report on Patentability and associated with PCT application No. PCT/JP2004/008024 that corresponds to the present application. In the International Preliminary Report, the relevancy of the Patent Document No. DE 10016041 was identified, and thus, Applicants believe that this reference should be entered on the record.

Claim 13 is withdrawn as it is directed to non-elected subject matter in response to a prior restriction requirement.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified patent application and earnestly solicit an early allowance of same. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Thomas C. Basso
Reg. No. 46,541
Customer No. 24573

Dated: October 20, 2008